



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/650,086	08/26/2003	James F. Bredt	ZCO-107CP2	5896

51414 7590 05/02/2007
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
PATENT ADMINISTRATOR
EXCHANGE PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02109-2881

EXAMINER

SHOSHO, CALLIE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1714

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/02/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10650086	8/26/03	BREDT ET AL.	ZCO-107CP2

GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
PATENT ADMINISTRATOR
EXCHANGE PLACE
BOSTON, MA 02109-2881

EXAMINER

Callie E.. Shosho

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

1714

20070425

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Callie E. Shosho
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1714

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/650,086

Applicant(s)

BREDT ET AL.

Examiner

Callie E. Shosho

Art Unit

1714

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Callie E. Shosho.

(3) _____.

(2) Natasha Us.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 4/16 & 4/18/07.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Callie Shosho
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

4/16/07 - The interview was based on draft copy of proposed claim amendment faxed to the examiner on 4/13/07.

Based on the proposed amendment, the examiner stated that there appeared to be no support in the present specification to recite "substantially free of water" with respect to the particulate material. The examiner also stated that there appeared to be no support in the present specification to recite "the particulate material being capable of supporting the article during three dimensional printing and suitable for being spread in a layer of dry particles having a thickness selected from a range of 25 to 125 microns" given that there appeared to be no disclosure of such thickness in the present specification. Applicants stated that there was support for such amendment in the specification. The examiner also questioned why applicants amended some of the claims to change "plaster" to "semihydrate of calcium sulfate" and what the difference is between these two compounds as well as the difference with gypsum. Applicants stated that such change was made to make clear that the composition is dry and to overcome prior art and that plaster, semihydrate of calcium sulfate, and gypsum are each different. For instance, semihydrate of calcium sulfate is reactive while gypsum is not. The examiner noted that claim 11 depended on cancelled claim 9.

4/18/07 - In response to the interview conducted 4/13/07, applicants faxed draft copy of proposed claim amendment to the examiner on 4/17/07. The interview was based on the faxed amendment.

The examiner noted that applicants clarified the difference between plaster, semihydrate of calcium sulfate, and gypsum but asked that evidence to support such explanation be provided especially in light of page 6, lines 12-23 of the present specification which appears to disclose that the terms plaster, semihydrate of calcium sulfate, and gypsum are equivalent and interchangeable.

The examiner stated that such amendment would overcome the 35 USC 112 rejections of record.